G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

File No. 173

1912.

(Musrai)

Serial Nos. 1—6

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—6

Part B for Novr 15

SUBJECT.

Slotrapatta post of Sri Chama rajeswaraswami, temple at Chama rajanagar

---

To, The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Dt
No 1082 Dy, 2-11-1915

Passes orders re Dharmadhyana
or —

GPB—10,000—28-8-15

1727

Secr t. Inner File No. 173 of 1912

Serial No.	
	To
2	The D. Comr. Mysore Dist No 1591 dt 11.4.1913 Forwards the petn for report Encl to petn No 1592 dt 11 4 13 Reminder Petn from Subrahmanya Sastri dt 16 4 1913. orders on the petn — " Forward to the Dy Comr for favour of report" (Initd) Cg. A. dt 16.4.1913 Draft forwarding the reminder petn in Contn for report & an Encl to petn Subd — RdA 185-6.6.1913 Reminder Issued No. 2458 dt 23 6 13
3.	From, the Dy Commr Mysore Distt Letter no 599/14 dt 26.6.1913, 1-7-1913. Submits the report called for in Sl. 2. The Dy. Commrs. letter explains the facts of the case in detail The Stotra Patha post in question is reported to be not a hereditary one.

JG.D
(Dy. Commrs. Hukum dt 9-6-1903)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

General & Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 173 of 1912

Serial No.

One Yagna Narayana Deekshitu was the original baramaSdar of the post in question. He had two sons - Rama Deekshitu father of the aplt Subrahmanya Shastri and Surya Narayana Deekshitu father-in-law of the respt Lakshmidevamma.

In the year 1891, during the life-time of the original holder, there was a partition of the properties by which the post in question fell to the share of Surya Narayana Deekshitu.

W

In 1902, Surya Narayana Deekshitu and his children died leaving the respt as the sole heiress to the properties.

Rama Deekshitu being then alive was looking after the post in question till his death in 1907 - After his death, the Dy Commr sanctioned the recommendation of the Local authorities to take work from the aplt on Condition of paying a moiety of the pay to the respt.

R

There seems to have been some dispute between them about the allowance to be paid to Lakshmidevamma. The matter came up before the Dy. Commr who directed that the baramaSd be made out in the name of the respt, one Chidambara Shastry being appointed

O

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 173 of 191 2

Serial No.

X

as her Gumastha - Against this order, Subrahmanya Shastry has appealed to Govt -

The grounds for appeal are :-

(1) that the Barawad should not be made out in the name of a woman,

(2) that he is the hakdar in the family entitled to hold the post.

(3) that in the Parikhat, ~~the appointment~~ it is said that the appointment ~~is~~ will have to be divided between the brothers.

[In his report No 65 Dt 27th Jany: 1910, the Amildar states that the practice of giving a portion of the pay for the maintenance of the hakdars thereof, is in ~~force~~ Vogue in the temple in question]

Submitted

Sd C(115)
23-10 1913. RM

Is a copy of the Parikhat on the file. If so what does it say as regards this post.

What is there ~~in Africa~~ to show that the office is not hereditary. How did Gopee Gumasta get it. ~~What~~.

Sd
31.10.13

There is a copy of the Parikhat in

W

NOTE —Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

post is hereditary.

He further reports that the Taluk Baraward Dakas show that yagnanarayana Dikshit was appointed to this post as per chief Commrs. order no. 24 Dy 10-7-1854.

It is also reported that Dharmadhyayana post and Stotrapatha post are identical.

Submtd. for orders.

A.V.(115)
25.5.1917.

Yagnanarayana Dikshit is said to have applt in the Ch: Commrs days owing to his brother Narayinda bhatta having taken leave & not turned up. The applt fell to the share of the 2nd son Suryanarayana Dikshit while the properties were divided. This man & his sons died leaving Lakshmidevamma the sole heiress gave the properties of Suryanarayana Dikshit, and her patta inland to the Rama Dikshit & the latter's son Subrahmanya Sastri were doing the duties of the post as punditas; but as the latter did not give her adequate amt of maintenance, she moved for another pandita being appointed. The Dy Commr ordered that Lakshmidevamma be appointed.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—5,000—9.21.14

R S 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 173 of 1912.

Serial No.

as karadoondar and one Chitambrish be appd her gumasta.

The following table shows the parties at a glance

Yegnanarayan adrikshat

Rama Dikshit	Suryanaraya Dikshit.
Subrahmanya Sastri. (appellt)	Son married Lakshmi Devamma (respt)

The following points in favour of the respondents & the Dy Comr's order are against the grounds of appeal.

1) The father-in-law of the respondent was actually holding the post tho' his Elder brother was alive.

2) The appellant himself was doing the duties of the post as her gumasta for some time giving her some allowance for maintenance, and he moved in the matter only when she complained of the inadequate sum.

3) G.O. No. 1074/M.J. 140. 11.2 & 20.1.12 declares the rights of female heirs of Injam Offices as valid.

XXI-K

The Dy Comr's order appealed against seems therefore to be quite in order

GLL
31.5.13

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—5000—9.11.11

S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 173 of 1912.

Serial No.

Is there any other precedent-
-ents than in the other minor services
of temples female heirs are competent
Such a practice will soon appear lead
to great deterioration in services
which are seldom hereditary remunerations
to attract more qualified

AN

Sd
5.6.15

Copies of G.O. nos 3863-M 7 15-95 dated
the 19th April 1905 and 4766 dated the
21st June 1905 are submitted for perusal.
These orders show that heretofore of
other services in temples had been
standing in the names of women, and
had formed a basis for conferring the
appointments on their descendants
& near relatives. The orders are put up
since as precedents for females
holding offices in temples this as shewn
by the undersigned, this would lead to
deterioration in temple services

RL
10/7/15. Subd by 1st member.

In the circumstances often
Case the appeal may be dismissed a

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—25,000—22-3-15

R 2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 173 of 1912.

Serial No.

there are precedents to show that female heirs are competent to hold offices which by reason of their sex they are incompetent to discharge. A suitable endowments is suggested in the records as a fair payment to the Hakdar after surrender. It would naturally mean that there would not be sufficient inducement for a capable man being attracted to the Service.

It appears to me that it would be in the interests of the temple Service if surrendership is not recognised as regards the claims of Hirers. At all events where the hakdar is incapable of performing the Service the right to appoint a capable surrender should vest in the management without any reservation of portion of the endowments to the Hakdar. This is a matter of general policy which I have touched upon also in another connection

If approved
Case may be posted for hearing

Sd
23.7.12

What is the remuneration -

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—25,000—22-3-15

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 173 of 1912

Serial No.

tion attached to the office? What was respt being paid?

There is strong reason to hold that such appts to such not be held by women. The case may be posted for hearing, notice being given to the respt.

31/7/15

31/7/15

31/7/15

av

The pay attached to the office is Rs 7/- under Govt's order, The respondent was getting Rs 3-8-0. Submd with dft notices to the respts.

AM 4-8-1915 (Lakshmidevamma).

4/8/15

Appd when is the notice to the appellant issued? Surely the office does not expect me to endorse the minutes.

4-8-15

Notice to apltr Submd

AM 4-8-15

4. Aug 1915

Pr Apptr p states that the bar

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—2,000—22 3-15

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 173 of 1912.

Serial No.

Reward should be made out in his name & that he will give ~~1/3rd~~ part of the pay to her. (whatever she gets from present pensata.)

J mis 362-15

(Please let me see whether there is any dharmaśāstra authority for succession of a woman to such Offices. Asstt Secy, Br III may be consulted.

21/8/15

Forwarded to Asst. Secy, Branch III. for favour of opinion.

16-8-15

There are no authorities in the Dharmaśāstra to support the contention that a woman can succeed to a religious office, like that in question. According to the Smṛtis, women are not entitled to recite Vedas, and as such are incapable of performing the duties imposed on the office holders.

Br VII

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—25,000—22-3-15

S.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 173 of 1912

Serial No.

Subd by Vr. member

The opinion of the Vice President reckoning to the same effect is also submitted. Neither of them seem any explicit direction in the Vyavahara Khanda as regards the hereditability of such Vrtis

Parties present — Dec 23 1913

The respondent says that she has kept a pumaster to whom she pays 5 Rs out of 7 Rs. received from ~~Govt~~ the temple.

Both the parties agree that as the respondent is a widow without means, she may be paid 3 Rs a month direct by the Temple authority & that the barawad be made out in the name of the appellant who will during the life of the respondent receive 4 Rs a month.

If the appellant who is a schoolmaster happens to be transferred and fails to procure a substitute for the ser-

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—20,000—30-6-15

12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 173 of 1912

Serial No.

vice, this arrangement will be liable to reversion.

Issue order accdgly.

23/9/15

Submtd. with a ~~draft~~ draft order.

4.10.1915.

5/10/15

Put up clean draft.

Typed clean & put up

Subd 5/10 member

7.10.15

Draft appd: by First member 23.10.15.

24/10/15

6 To: 1082 dt 2-11-15, to be of. Mysore, for acdgly of the local order, directing that the amount may be ... in the ...

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—20,000—30-6-15

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Inam File No. 173 of 191 2

Serial No.

1

of the appellant - who will, during the life-time of the respondent who shall get Rs 3/- per month decreed by the Temple authorities, get Rs 4/- a month & that this arrangement is liable to revision if the appellant fails to get a proper deputation & attend to the temple duties & thereby the temple suffers by getting

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—25,000—30 4 15

15

1913

DIARY No. 412

19/2-1913

SECTION

FILE No. కర్ణాటక 3-1

SERIAL No. 1

15 ಮುಂದಿನ ಸಂಚಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಿರಿ. ಗಣಿತಲೋಕ

ಹಿಂಗಡಿಸಿದಕ್ಕೆ ಲಾಭರುಜಿಗಳು ಶೇಕಡಾ ಬೆಂಕಿಯಂತೆ
ಈ ಅಕ್ಷರಗಳು ಗಳಿಸುವ ಪ್ರೇರಕ ಲೇವಾದೇವಿಯಾಗಿ ಚಾರಿಸುವ ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗಾಗಿ ಬಡ್ಡಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿ
ಶತಮಾನದಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯುವ ಚಕ್ರವಡ್ಡಿಯಾಗಿ ಪಾವತಿಸಿದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪಾವತಿಸಿರುವ
ಪಿರಿಯಡ್ಡುಗಳು ಬಡ್ಡಿಯ ಸಹಿತ ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿದ್ದು

ಪ್ರಮಾಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬಳಸಿದ ಮೂಲಧನವನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಿದವರಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ
ಬೆರಿಯವರನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಿದವರಿಂದ ಬಡ್ಡಿ ಸಹಿತ ಮೂಲಧನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ
ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಪಾವತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ
ಪಿರಿಯಡ್ಡುಗಳು ಬಡ್ಡಿಯ ಸಹಿತ ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿದ್ದು. ಈ ಅವಿಭಜಿತ ಹಿಂದೂ ಕುಟುಂಬದ
ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಿದವರಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ
ಬೆರಿಯವರನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಿದವರಿಂದ ಬಡ್ಡಿ ಸಹಿತ ಮೂಲಧನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ
ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಪಾವತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ
ಪಿರಿಯಡ್ಡುಗಳು ಬಡ್ಡಿಯ ಸಹಿತ ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿದ್ದು.

ಸಹಿ/-

ದಿ 29.8.1912

5/4/13
NO 159 Enq. dy 11 1/4
Misc 173-12-2

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT. 17

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No .....

The accompanying Petition Registered
No. 412 dated. 29.8.12
received at the General and Revenue
Secretariat from. Subrahmanya Shastri
of Chamarajnagar appeal-
ing against the Dy. Comm's.
order directing that Stotra
-patha pooja of Sri chama-
rajeswara swamy temple
be made each in the name
of Lakshmidevamma,

2
is forwarded, together with its enclosures,
to the ..... Dy ... Commr
Mysore Dist .....
..... for ... report
with records.

By Order
C.a
D&Z
Secretary
For 9/4
12/9/12
BANGALORE,
191

P. T. O.

HH
9/4

2 ಡಿಪಿ ನಂ 1592 ದಿ 11. 4. 49

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ ..... ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

.....

.....

.....

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಹುಕುಂ.

.....

.....

.....

.....

~~ಈಗಾಗಲೇ~~ ನೀವು ~~ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ~~ ..... D. 412 ನೇ

~~ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ~~ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ..... ಬಗ್ಗೆ

.....

.....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

Secretary.

VII 2 1 6 13

From 191

The Deputy Commissioner
Anapore District

DIARY No. 2303

1912-1913
Madras
FILE No. 173-12
SERIAL No. 3

To The Secretary to Govt,
Revenue Branch

Dated 23-6-13.

Despatched 26-6-13

Received

General No. 577
No.

Enclosure No. 6.1.

Submits records relating to the petition of Subramanya Sastri, ~~appellant~~ appealing against this office order re Shotrumpattu post of Sri Chamarajeswara Swami temple.

GPB—50,000—20 9 12

Office of

No 599 / fill

Nilgiris 23/26 June 1913

From

[illegible]

To

M.R Sreenivasaraghava Esqr, M.A.,

[illegible]

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No 1591/mmx 173-12-2 dated 11-4-1913 calling for a report on the petition of Subramanya Sastri of —— Chamarajanagar appealing against this office order directing that the Stotrapata post of the Sri Chamarajeswara Swami temple at Chamarajanagar be made in the name of Lakshmidevammah etc I have the honor to state that one Yagna Narayana Dikshita

was

original karanavadar of one

20

of the Stotrapata posts of the Sri Shanmarajeswara Swami temple, that he had two sons by name Rama Dikshita father of the petitioner — Subramanya Sastri and Suryanarayana Dikshita father-in-law of Lakshmi-Devamma in question

During the lifetime of the original holder of the post — his two sons made a partition of the properties of their father wherein the Stotrapata post in question fell to the share of Suryanarayana Dikshit.

In 1902 Suryanarayana Dikshita and his children died leaving the above said Lakshmi-Devamma

W
vide copy of the Pankhal of 1891

as sole heiress to the

V Ramadikshita being then alive
was looking after the post in question
and on his death in 1907 the petitioners
Subramanya Sastri was appointed R
to look after the duties paying a
share of the income of the post to
Lakshmi Devammah for her maintenance.

Subramanya Sastri insisted
upon paying only Rs 2/- to —
Lakshmi Devammah who petitioned
to this office praying that she
may be paid Rs 3/8/- and a gumasta
whom she proposed might be
appointed adding that she did
not consent to Subramanya
Sastri being her gumasta.

The Amildar of Chamarajanagar
was

then called upon to submit a report as to whom Lakshmi Devammah would propose as gumasta and what that gumasta would pay to her. When Lakshmidevammah deposed that one Krishna Bhatta her kerotee of 12 years may be made the karawardar.

The above proposal was not approved by Mr. M. Kanthraj Urs that then Deputy Commissioner on the ground that Krishna Bhatta had no manner of relationship to be made the karawardar, and he ordered that the name Lakshmi Devammah may be shown in the karawardar if she is able to a[illegible]

Competent gumasta

2

Thereupon the said Lakshmi-
Devammah proposed one Chitambara
Sastri as her gumasta and Mr.
K Krishna Iyer offg. Deputy Commissioner
ordered on 18-7-1912 that the baraward
be made in the name of the said
Lakshmi Devammah and Chitambara
Sastri be appointed her gumasta.

It is against the above
order that Subramanya Sastri
has now appealed

The entire file of papers
on the subject ending with
Nanjangud Division officers
no. 330 dated 3-6-1913 and the
appeal

petition with its enclosures

24

with your official memorandum under

reply are herewith submitted for

reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient Servant,

Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore [illegible]

G R.S. 29A] 25

190 .

From

Secy. to the Govt of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The D.C., Mysore Dist.

Dated 15-11-13

Despatched

Received

General No. 1425

No. 177 12-4,

Enclosure No. 1

Adverting to Correspondence ending with his letter no. 4 dy 30th June 1913 on reporting on the appeal petition of Subrahmanya Shastri regarding the Stotra Patha Kosh of Sri Chamarajeswara Swamy temple at Chamarajnagar, has the honor to request ~~to be furnished with~~ ~~detailed~~ information on the points noted below:-

(1) How did Yagna Narayana

If as it is stated the Stotra Patha Kosh is not hereditary

C.R. 15/11

MGOPT—20,000—16-2-0

Deekshith, his original baraw
~~get the post~~ ~~?~~ ~~Mr~~ [illegible] is
appointed. Whether
~~Is the post is posting~~
hereditary ?

(2) Is the other
post mentioned in
Parikhed. The same
as the other Patha
post has not been disputed

2) The Vern. records are
herewith returned for
reference and re-submission.

By order

for Secretary

5/11/13

GPB –100 000 –29 7 14

Tm. 75 dw

191

From The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Genl. & Rev. Depts
Bangalore & Mysore

Dated

Despatched 7th May 1915.

Received

General No 454.
No

Enclosure No one file.

Submitting a report on the
Sthothrapatha kept of the
Sree Chamarajeswaraswamy
temple at Chamarajanagar

No. 484.
Re: 1 file. Office of the Dep
mysore District.

Dated mysore 6th/7th may 1915.

From

A. Subramanya Iyer, Esqr. B.A.
Deputy Commissioner,
mysore District,



To

D. M. Narasinga Rao, Esqr, B.A, B.L.,
Offg. Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharaja of mysore
General and Revenue Depts.
Mufrasil Branch.

Sir

With reference to your docket no:
1425/173-12-14 dated 15th November 1913
calling for further information regarding
the Sholiarpatha post of the Sri Chama-
rajeswara temple at Chamarajanagar, I
have the honor to state as follows:-

The Amildar of the Chamarajanagar
Taluk states that vacancies in the offices
of the temple are filled up from among
the descendants of the previous holders
but that no particular reference is

to show that the Sthothrapatha post is hereditary. On reference to the list of disbursements it is reported that Yagnanarayana dikshit was appointed to this post as per late chief commissioner's order no. 24 dated 10-7-1854 which was issued when Ranjundabhatta (the elder brother of Yagnanarayana dikshit) the previous holder of the post took leave for twenty days but did not present himself for duty at the end of the period.

3) Formerly, the persons appointed for teaching Veda, Sahitya, etc, in the temple without receiving any fees from the students (ఫీజులు వసూలు చేయరాదు) were termed Dharmadhyayanadavaru and the same were according to the revised list of 1898 renamed as Sthothrapathadavaru; thus Dharmadhyayana post and Sthothrapatha post are identical.

The Vernacular page ...

2 with Sub Division offi

no: 227/9-3-1915 accompanies.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

Deputy Commissioner
Dry Sarthisthi

ಪಿರ್ಯಾದಿ.

ಚಾಲಕರಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಈ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ 14-9-15 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 10 ಗಂಟೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಣ್ಣನ ಮಗಳಾದ ಕುಮಾರಿ ಸಿಂಧು ಎಂಬಾಕೆಯು ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ನನಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 13-9-15 ರಂದು ಸಂಜೆ 5 ಗಂಟೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಳು ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬಳೇ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಅವಳ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಕನಾದ ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ಎಂಬಾತನು ಅವಳ ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಅವಳ ಮೈ ಕೈ ಮುಟ್ಟಿ ಅವಳಿಗೆ ಅಸಭ್ಯವಾಗಿ ವರ್ತಿಸಿದ್ದು, ಅವಳು ಅವನಿಗೆ ಬೈದು ಹೊರಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದು, ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಅವಳು ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಹೇಳಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಳು. ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಮಂಜುನಾಥನಿಗೆ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಹೇಳಲು ಅವನ ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಬರುವಾಗ ಅವನ ಮನೆಯ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇದ್ದ ಅವನ ಅಣ್ಣ ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ಎಂಬಾತನು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಅಡ್ಡಗಟ್ಟಿ ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಲ್ಲೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು, ಆಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ ಜನರು ಜಗಳವನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಿದ್ದು, ನಾನು ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಈ ದಿನ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಸಿಂಧು ನನಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು,

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

31

Appeal No. of

Appellant.	*Vs.*	Respondent.
Subrahmanya Sastri of Chamarajnagar.		Lakshmidevamma.

Subject.

Claim to be appointed to the Stotra Patha or Dharmadhyana post of Sri Chamarajeswara Swami temple at Chamarajnagar.

FACTS OF THE CASE.

One Nanjunda Bhatta was the original Barawardar. Owing to his absence ~~in~~ without leave, his brother Yagnanarayana Dikshit was appointed to the post under the late Chief Commissioner's Order No.24 dated 10th July 1854. Yagnanarayana Dikshit had two sons, viz., Rama Dikshit father of the appellant Subrahmanya Sastri and Suryanarayana Dikshit, father-in-law of the respondent Lakshmidevamma. At a partition of the family properties effected in 1891, the office in

GPB—500—13-8-19

S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

question fell to the share of the younger son Surya Narayana Dikshit who died in 1902 leaving only his daughter-in-law Lakshmidevamma, the respondent behind him.

Since then Rama Dikshit looked after the duties of the office till his death in 1907 and after him his son Subrahmanya Shastri -- the present appellant -- was doing the work paying an allowance to the respondent. As however they did not agree as regards the amount, the respondent applied for permission to appoint her own Gumasta, and the Deputy Commissioner ordered that the Baraward be made out in the name of Lakshmidevamma and her nominee one Chidambara Sastri may be appointed as her Gumasta.

Subrahmanya Sastri appeals to Government urging his claim to the post on the ground that no woman is competent to be appointed to an office of the kind.

GPS—12,000—15-2-13.

The case was finally heard by Government on 23rd September 1915, both the contending parties being present in person.

-- -------

Decision.

The respondent says that she has appointed a Gumasta to whom she pays Rs.5/- out of Rs.7/- received from the temple. Both the parties agree that as the respondent is a widow without means, she may be paid Rs.6/- a month direct by the temple authority and that the Barawaard may be made out in the name of the appellant who will during the life of the respondent receive only Rs.4/- a month.

Government approve of this arrangement which is suitable and it will accordingly be given effect to. If the appellant who is a school master, happens to be transferred and fails to procure a substitute for the service, this arrangement will be liable to revision.

G. R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

Memo No. 1082 Ent P. 34 / 173-12-6 / Order 173-2-11.1915 / D.

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, returning the records received with his letter No.454 dated 7th May 1915.

"By Order"

ha
7.11.15

For Revenue Secretary to Govt.

Revenue Department.

23/10/15

Issued

No 1083 / 173-12-6 / 2.11.15 Copy to Huzur Secy

GPB—12,000—15-2-13.

GPB—500—23-10-14

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. of

Appellant.	*vs.*	Respondent.
Subrhmanya Sastri of Chamarajnagar.		**Lakshmidevamma.**

Subject.

Claims to be appointed to the totra Patha or Dharmadhyana post of Sri Chamarajeswara Swami temple at Chamarajnagar.

\- - - - - - - - - -

Facts of the case.

One Nanjunda Bhatta was the original Paraupakar. Owing to his absence without leave, his brother Yagnanarayana Dikshit was appointed to the post under the late Chief Commissioner's order No.24 dated 10th July 1854. Yagnanarayana Dikshit had two sons, viz., Rama Dikshit father of the appellant Subrahmanya Sastri and Suryanarayana Dikshit, father-in-law of the respondent Lakshmidevamma. At a partition of the family properties effected in 1891, the office in question fell to the share of the younger son Suryanarayana Dikshit who died in 1902 leaving only his daughter-in-law Lakshmidevamma, the respondent behind him.

Since then Rama Dikshit looked after the duties of the office till his death in 1907 and after him his son Subramanya Sastri--the present appellant--was doing the work paying an allowance to the

to the respondent. As however they did not agree as regards the amount, the respondent applied for permission to appoint her own Gumasta, and the Deputy Commissioner ordered that the Baraward be made out in the name of Lakshmidevamma and that her nominee one Chidambara Sastri may be appointed as her Gumasta.

Subrahmanya Sastri appeals to Government urging his claim to the post on the ground that no woman is competent to be appointed to an office of the kind.

The case was finally heared by Government on 23rd September 1915, both the contending parties being present in person.

D e c i s i o n.

The respondent says that she has appointed a Gumasta to whom she pay Rs.5/- out of Rs.7/- received from the temple. Both the parties agree that as the respondent is a widow without means, she may be paid Rs.3/- a month direct by the temple authority and that the Baraward may be made out in the name of the appellant who will during the life of the respondent receive only Rs.4/- a month.

Government approve of this arrangement which is suitable and it will accordingly be given effect to. If the appellant who is a school-master, happens to be transferred and fails to procure a substitute for the service, this arrangement will be liable to revision.

- - - - -

Memo No.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commission-

er

Stotra Patha or Dharmadhyayana Post.

No. 1082—Muz. 173-12, dated 2nd November 1915.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Appellant	*vs.*	Respondent
Subrahmanya Sastri of Chamrajnagar.		Lakshmidevamma.

Subject.

Claim to be appointed to the Stotra Patha or Dharmadhyayana post of Sri Chamarajeswaraswami temple at Chamrajnagar.

Facts of the Case.

One Nanjunda Bhatta was the original Barawardar. Owing to his absence without leave, his brother Yagnanarayana Dikshit was appointed to the post under the late Chief Commissioner's Order No. 24, dated 10th July 1854. Yagnanarayana Dikshit had two sons, *viz.*, Rama Dikshit, father of the appellant Subrahmanya Sastri and Suryanarayana Dikshit, father-in-law of the respondent Lakshmidevamma. At a partition of the family properties effected in 1891, the office in question fell to the share of the younger son Suryanarayana Dikshit who died in 1902 leaving only his daughter-in-law Lakshmidevamma, the respondent, behind him.

Since then Rama Dikshit looked after the duties of the office till his death in 1907 and after him his son Subrahmanya Sastri, the present appellant, was doing the work paying an allowance to the respondent. As, however, they did not agree as regards the amount, the respondent applied for permission to appoint her own Gumasta, and the Deputy Commissioner ordered that the Baraward be made out in the name of Lakshmidevamma and that her nominee one Chidambara Sastri may be appointed as her Gumasta.

Subrahmanya Sastri appeals to Government urging his claim to the post on the ground that no woman is competent to be appointed to an office of the kind.

The case was finally heard by Government on 23rd September 1915, both the contending parties being present in person.

Decision.

The respondent says that she has appointed a Gumasta to whom she pays Rs. 5 out of Rs. 7 received from the temple. Both the parties agree that as the respondent is a widow without means, she may be paid Rs. 3 a month direct by the temple authority and that the Baraward may be made out in the name of the appellant who will, during the life of the respondent, receive only Rs. 4 a month.

Government approve of this arrangement which is suitable and it will accordingly be given effect to. If the appellant who is a school-master, happens to be transferred and fails to procure a substitute for the service, this arrangement will be liable to revision.

Memo No 1082—Muz. 173-12, dated 2nd November 1915.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, returning the records received with his letter No. 454, dated 7th May 1915.

By Order,

for *Secy. to Govt, Rev. Dept.*

Government of His Highness the Mahar of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

G. O. No. 1082—Muz. 173-12, dated 2nd Nov. 1915

Stotra Patha or Dharmadhyayana Post.

Passing orders regarding the claim to be appointed to the — of the Sri Chamarajeswaraswami temple at Chamrajnagar

W D 1046—GPB -11 11-15—250